



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/897,354	07/02/2001	Pekka Ketola	460-010421-US(PAR)	8266
2512	7590	10/18/2004	EXAMINER	
PERMAN & GREEN 425 POST ROAD FAIRFIELD, CT 06824			LIN, WEN TAI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2154	

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/897,354

Applicant(s)

KETOLA, PEKKA

Examiner

Wen-Tai Lin

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 July 2001 and 16 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/2/01; 6/16/03
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: ~~2783~~  
2154

## DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-21 are presented for examination.
2. The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

### *Arrangement of the Specification*

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC (See 37 CFR 1.52(e)(5) and MPEP 608.05. Computer program listings (37 CFR 1.96(c)), "Sequence Listings" (37 CFR 1.821(c)), and tables having more than 50 pages of text are permitted to be submitted on compact discs.) or  
REFERENCE TO A "MICROFICHE APPENDIX" (See MPEP § 608.05(a). "Microfiche Appendices" were accepted by the Office until March 1, 2001.)
- (e) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
  - (1) Field of the Invention.
  - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (f) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (g) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (h) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
- (i) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (j) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A

Art Unit: 2783

"Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

3. The specification is objected to because it lacks the necessary partitions as described above.

4. Claims 4-6, 11-14 and 18-20 are objected to because the following terms lack antecedent basis: (i) "the user" in claims 4-6, 11-13 and 18-19; (ii) "the reply message" in claims 6, 13 and 20; and (iii) "the wireless terminal" in claim 14.

5. Claims 3-6 and 17-20 are objected to because the word "possibility" in the claim languages is vague and non-precise. That is, to an extreme it could lead to broad interpretation such as incorporating no further limitations at all. For purpose of prior art rejection in this office action, the word "possibility" has been changed to "capability". Clarification/Correction is required in response to this office action.

6. Claims 1-21 are objected to because it is not clear whether the notation "(PDP1, PDP2)" in the claim languages is meant to limit the connections to a PDP (Packet Data Protocol) type or not. For prior art rejection in this office action, the parenthesized terms are ignored. However, Applicant is required to clarify/correct the notations in response to this office action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 1-4, 8-11 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Picard et al.[U.S. Pat. No. 6233318].

9. As to claim 1, Picard teaches the invention as claimed including: a system for controlling at least a first and a second remote mailbox [e.g., 66, 68, Figs.1-3] located in at least one e-mail server, in a terminal [e.g., 60, Fig.1], characterized in that between the terminal and said e-mail server maintaining said first remote mailbox, and between the terminal and said e-mail server maintaining said second remote mailbox, at least ~~partly simultaneous connection is arranged to be set-up, wherein said remote mailboxes~~ are arranged to be controlled by means of the terminal substantially simultaneously by means of said connections [col.5, lines 13-21; col.2, lines 26-33; col.13, lines 11-39;

Art Unit: 2783

note that connection from the terminal to the first and second mailboxes is achieved by substantially simultaneous separate TCP/IP and/or POP sessions].

10. As to claim 2, Picard further teaches that the terminal is a wireless communication device [col.4, lines 4-14].

11. As to claim 3, Picard further teaches that an e-mail program [e.g., the browser] is arranged to be used for controlling said remote mailboxes, which e-mail program is provided with the capability to control several remote mailboxes [e.g., issuing a refresh request] substantially simultaneously, and in which each remote mailbox is provided with a unique identification, such as an icon or a name [col.13, lines 11-40; col.21, lines 24 – 34].

12. As to claim 4, Picard further teaches that a notification of an e-mail message that has arrived in one of said remote mailboxes is arranged to be produced for the user, characterized in that said notification is arranged to be provided with a unique identification of that remote mailbox to which the e-mail message has arrived [col.17, lines 8-15; col.20, lines 56-59; col.13, lines 11-21].

---

13. As to claims 8-11 and 15-18, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1-4, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-4 above.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claims 5-6, 12-13 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Picard et al. (hereafter "Picard") [U.S. Pat. No. 6233318], as applied to claims 1-4, 8-11 and 15-18 above.

16. As to claims 5-6, Picard further teaches that the user in the e-mail program is provided with the capability to formulate and send e-mail messages [col.3, lines 60-62; col.18, line 66 – col.19, line 25; Fig.11]. Picard does not specifically teach that the e-mail address of the user to be attached to the e-mail message to be transmitted is arranged to be selected in the e-mail program.

However, it is well known in the art to click the "reply" button for replying a message, wherein the original receiving mailbox's address is used as a sending mailbox. In a like manner, one would like to provide a sending mailbox's address that is consistent with an address that the recipient of the mail can be replied to. Since Picard's system integrates existing mailboxes of a subscriber and allow reception of mails from

Art Unit: 2783

non-subscribers (i.e., the non-subscribers only knows the address of a convention mailboxes), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the received mailbox as default sending address because by doing so it would make Picard's system transparent to the non-subscribers [col.8, lines 33-34 and 46- 67].

17. As to claims 12-13 and 19-20, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1-6, 8-11 and 15-18, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-6, 8-11 and 15-18 above.

18. Claims 7, 14 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Picard et al.(hereafter "Picard") [U.S. Pat. No. 6233318], as applied to claims 1-6, 8-13 and 15-20 above, further in view of AAPA [Applicant admitted prior art].

19. As to claims 7, 14 and 21, Picard does not specifically teach that the system/method can be adopted in a GPRS system which contains means for establishing PDP connections. However, AAPA teaches that it is well known that a GPRS subscriber can have several different PDP connections, by which it facilitates the IP connections from a mobile device [col.2, lines 9-19].

---

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have extended Picard's system to GPRS subscribers because AAPA teaches that GPRS system looks externally like an ordinary subnet of the Internet

Art Unit: 2783

network and by expanding Picard's service to GPRS subscribers it would further broaden Picard's customer base.

20. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Neal [U.S. Pat. No. 6411685];

Brunson [U.S. Pat. No. 5647002];

Burgard et al. [U.S. PGPub 20030145059];

Dorfman et al. [U.S. Pat. No. 6563912];

Wagner et al. [U.S. Pat. No. 6169911]; and

Cannon et al. [U.S. Pat. No. 6519327].

21. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 (three) months and 0 days from the mail date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will result in ABANDONMENT of the application (see 35 U.S.C. 133, M.P.E.P. 710.02, 710.02(b)).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wen-Tai Lin whose telephone number is (703)305-

4875. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-5:00) .

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703)305-8498. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2783

numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703)872-9306 for official communications; and

(703)746-5516 for status inquires draft communication.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

Wen-Tai Lin

October 8, 2004

*Allen Jan Li*  
*10/8/04*